

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
1	MacPeck	Lee	482 West 1875 North, Layton, Utah 84041	801-529-5777	lmacpeek@ksgdist.com	Yes	I travel through the affected area for work. I have seen the need for this type of project for a long time. I was initially in favor of Proposal #4. However, after seeing the plans, I really like this Proposal (No. 2). I was able to talk to several UDOT representatives and am pleased with their answers and knowledge. I know no plan can please everyone, but I think this comes close.	Thank you for your comment.
2	Geraci	Mary Ann	189 South Main Street Trlr 46, Layton, Utah 84041	801-529-4417		Yes	Why you ask? Because it's not going to be going over my (little) house!!! I already bounce along in my life because I have I-15 on the east and the train (choo-choo; train whistle) which shakes and wakes me up and then there those planes, so I'm so glad no one will be driving over me!!!! I'm used to the sounds and the shaking now and it's not bad - heck my clothes washer shakes, rocks and rolls me more anyway. Thanks for leaving me my (little) home!! PSS and a garden as soon as I can not get started on it.	Thank you for your comment.
3	Denhalter	Darryl	1445 West Silvercreek Drive, Layton, Utah 84041	801-444-3967	ddenhalter@dsdmail.net	Yes	I am both a resident who lives in the study area and the principal of Layton Elementary School. As a resident, I see the need for this and I thank you for finding solutions. As the principal, my primary concern is for the many students who are required to walk to school. Some are as young as five years old. Please consider their safety in your plans. I like Alternative "2" best. Please give Gentile Street as little traffic as possible. Thanks.	On the safety of school children walking to and from school, their safety has been taken into account during the development of the Preferred Alternative. The Davis County School District's Student Neighborhood Access Plan has been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative. See Section 3.1.7 - Pedestrians and Bicycle Facilities in the Draft EIS.
4	Harris	Tyler	701 South 300 East, Layton, Utah 84041	801-628-1166	technik_tsi@hotmail.com	Yes and No	Yes and no. Yes because all the traffic going that direction and no because it is going to cause a 30-ft overpass to be next to my home and I'm sure that isn't going to help my property value at all. I live right next door to where the proposed overpass is going to be and with the slope of the overpass, it may damage or affect my home. I would really like to be kept in close contact or on a mailing list to know of any progressions to the project and/or any effect it may have on my home. Call or email, thanks.	Due to your close proximity to the proposed new roadway, UDOT will keep in touch with you during the design stage (should a build alternative be selected) to discuss any potential impacts on your property, should property acquisition be required. A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.
5	Coombs	Kim	632 South 125 West, Layton, Utah 84041	801-547-1350	kim.coombs@hotmail.com	No	I believe two areas of concern have not been addressed. Safety of children and impact on Flint Street turning onto Gentile. 1. Currently traffic to turn onto Gentile from Flint during peak hours is dangerous (angle of street) and impossible to turn onto. With this plan, more traffic will impact this street intersection as a hazardous safety condition. Simulation slides do not show impact of this street. Need more study at this location. 2. Safety of children - elementary school is near this intersection. What can be done to secure a safer solution?	1. As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Using an analysis that includes all of the projects on the WFRC RTP and Layton City's Master Plan, traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020. 2. On the safety of school children walking to and from school, their safety has been taken into account during the development of the Preferred Alternative. The Davis County School District's Student Neighborhood Access Plan has been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative. See Section 3.1.7 - Pedestrians and Bicycle Facilities in the Draft EIS.
6	Randall	Bronson & Rayeanne	174 Dawson Street, Layton, Utah 84041		ray-e28bron29@msn.com	No	We already have enough traffic through this area. We don't need any more. This road you want to use as an additional road is used for a big portion of our children walking to and from school. All this is going to cause is the traffic killing lots of children. I think you should just put it somewhere else, but who are we just one voice that doesn't count.	As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020. Further, on the safety of school children walking to and from school, their safety has been taken into account during the development of the Preferred Alternative. The Davis County School District's Student Neighborhood Access Plan has been incorporated into the Preferred Alternative. See Section 3.1.7 - Pedestrians and Bicycle Facilities in the Draft EIS.
7	Brown	Larry	5764 South 2325 West, Roy, Utah 84067	801-710-5999		Yes	I own Building #1 in the Fort Lane Plaza (360 South Fort Lane). It appears that significant impact will result from raising and widening. 1 1/2 buildings taken and the parking of the west end of the third. Loss of parking will affect the entire business plaza. At a minimum, a retaining wall is needed to preserve as much space for parking, snow removal, and water detention. As the president of the Fort Lane Plaza Association, I would appreciate being kept informed during the design process.	The decision as to whether to include a retaining wall for this area would be made during the design phase of the project, should a build alternative be selected and your input would be valuable. The EIS shows the worst case scenario for potential impacts, which would include the removal of 1 building housing Midvalley Motor and the truncation of another building used for storage. A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
8	Watt	Darrel	1851 Mark Street, Layton, Utah 84041			Yes	Is it possible to get a personal copy of the I-15 aerial photo of the Main Street view as well? Thanks.	A copy will be sent to your address.
9	Willden	Ed & Susan	744 South 200 East, Layton, Utah 84041	801-544-2029	susan@willden.org	Yes	We live on 200 East and are very concerned about having it connect directly to 750 South because of potential problems with such a small street. We are mostly concerned with large trailers and mobile homes coming off of 750 going south on 200 East for a shortcut to Blaine Jensens. With the large rigs, small street, young families and drivers with little or no experience driving their new rigs. Please help us avoid what may seem like a minor problem but it's major to us. Let IHC have their exit into a big parking lot and leave 200 East closed.	The connection of 200 East to the 750 South connection is a Layton City issue and is beyond the scope of this project. The intersection is included in the EIS because the Larson Lane access has to be realigned due to the closure of the Flint Street access. The location shown in the EIS is the only practicable location for proper spacing between the Flint Street and Main Street intersection. Further, the closure of 900 South would leave the residential area south of the proposed 750 South connection without an additional access.
10	Hart	Dorothy	927 South 225 East, Layton, Utah 84041	801-544-1482	dlmhart2@sisna.com	Yes	I currently live one block south of 900 South. My husband can walk to the train station. If 900 South is closed off with a cul-de-sac at the end, will we still be able to access Main Street by foot or bike?	Since Main Street would be elevated to approximately 30 feet to go over the UTA tracks, you would not be able to access it without using the 750 South connection. There would be bicycle lanes on both sides of the 750 South connection and a sidewalk on the north side of the 750 South connection.
11	Wamhoff	Darrell	492 West 300 South, Layton, Utah 84041	801-547-6797	dwamhoff@gmail.com	No	I think the whole proposal actually contributes more congestion down Flint and reduces the quality of life for inhabitants as it will distribute more traffic. I really hate the flow of the interchange dumping a lot of traffic to move up and down Flint. I understand the plan is to link this with a road extending out to Angel Street or further; however, this alone will make Flint a very busy and dangerous street. The best alternative is to NOT build a 4 lane street coming off I-15 to Flint.	As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020.
12	Muse	Kristen	1015 West Gentile Street, Layton, Utah 84041	801-544-4053		Yes	Please assist the displaced land owners/users as they may run into the same problems Shirley Park has when UDOT forced the sale of ancestral property to create a parking lot for Frontrunner in Layton. She used the Main Street Property as income and has yet to resume this income she lived off of.	A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. See Section 3.1.5 - Relocations in the Draft EIS.
13	Parr	Valerie	438 Rosewood Lane #27, Layton, Utah 84041	801-546-1601	valerie.parr@msn.com	Yes	The new intersection should have a good pedestrian walkway to get from Fort Lane to FrontRunner station and back. Please discuss or show at next public meeting.	The Preferred Alternative includes sidewalks on the north side of the 750 South connection and on both sides of Main Street, which pedestrians can use to access the FrontRunner station from Fort Lane. See Section 3.1.7 - Pedestrians and Bicycle Facilities in the Draft EIS.
14	Shumway	Michael	309 West Dawson, Layton, Utah 84041	801-682-1092		No	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project doesn't encompass all of construction necessary to make the presented projections accurate. There are too many dependencies. I find the research, as presented, misleading and the scope ill-defined. According to Jim Horrocks, access from the proposed IHC facility would necessarily be onto Flint Street. Flint is currently projected to have approx. 20-50% traffic increase. I am concerned that traffic along Flint won't be sustainable without widening- given another large project. Also, noise walls will likely be necessary for the homes surrounding the proposed 750 expansion. Finally, the projections are based on the expansion of King Street. 750 South, etc. These projects success or failure will have a tremendous impact on the outcome of this project. I'm concerned that construction won't proceed on those and traffic on Flint, Gentile, 200 North, etc. will be unbearable. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020. A noise study was performed as part of the EIS process and it was determined that, although there would be noise impacts to the homes along Larson Lane from the Preferred Alternative, noise walls in that area would not meet the reasonableness criteria in the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy due to the high cost per benefited receiver. For more information, see Section 3.1.8 - Noise in the Draft EIS. The expansions of King Street and 750 South are beyond the scope of this project. However, they are included in Layton City's Master Plan and Layton City is committed to the 750 South expansion being done. Further, it is in the WFRC RTP.
15	Dansie	Jay	571 South Fort Lane, Layton, Utah 84041	801-544-3227	jaybdansie@msn.com	Yes	Get it done!!!!	Thank you for your comment.
16	Galbraith	H. Lynn	471 East 200 South, Kaysville, Utah 84037	801-544-2017	galbraithlc@sisna.com	No	Main Street that connects Kaysville and Layton is shunted through Fort Lane. Without a more direct route, traffic may increase along Flint and Angel Street to get to Layton. There is enough traffic to justify 4 lanes between cities. Also it may increase traffic down 200 North (Kaysville). I wished UDOT would consult with our city staff/council when these projects are made. At least we'll have answers for the public and maybe help in planning process. (City Councilman)	Kaysville City officials were consulted about this project on several occasions last fall regarding the proposed southern extension of King Street. Kaysville advised that they did not want King Street extended into Kaysville.

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
17	Hyde	Curtis	60 North Main, Layton, Utah 84041	801-540-1907	chydes4@msn.com	Yes	Parking are on North Main is going to be reduced due to possible right-of-way. (Property ownership) Please talk to Harris Adams about railroad actually on west side of Main. South traffic lanes not on north side or original Main Street in front of my property. His phone number is 825-3586.	The Preferred Alternative would convert some property along Main Street previously used as roadway and currently used for parking back to roadway use. The ownership of this property is still in question and still being researched. Once this ownership question is resolved, the property owners will be compensated for the right-of-way acquisition. A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.
18	Dodge	Allen	268 Flint Street, Layton, Utah 84041	801-547-1198	wdodge@dsdmail.net	Yes	I would like to thank all those involved in the EIS and just say that I am in favor of this interchange being built. I understand the time that it will take to be completed and the scope of the project I also know that when it is finished, it will be a great asset to the surrounding areas. This cannot come soon enough. I do have one questions. How much of an increase in traffic is being predicted or projected for Flint Street? Thanks for the great work.	As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020.
19	Covieo	Kim	1150 East 400 North, Kaysville, Utah 84037	801-544-1291	kimcovieo@yahoo.com	?	After attending the meeting last night, I have concerns. Last night was the first night my building and business was on the list to be taken out by the new interchange. My business is at 199 South Main street (Allco Auto Parts). One real concern is the interchange has been in the works for years and every meeting I have attended, my business has not been on the list to be taken; therefore I have not looked for a new location. Most of the property along Main Street has been bought by developers. I have been in business in Layton in the same location for almost 38 years and still have the desire to work for several more. If your intent is to take my building and business, I would ask that UDOT and Layton City help me relocate close to my current location not more than 2 or 3 away. I would like to meet to UDOT and Layton City as soon as possible. One of my big concerns I have is taking care of my family. This is my only income. I had plans to stay at the same location, sell my business and rent the building for retirement. I would ask that you please help me. I am too old to start all over again. It is very hard to start a new business from scratch.	A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. See Section 3.1.5 - Relocations of the Draft EIS.
20	D'Ewart	Brian	38 East Gentile Street, Layton, Utah 84041	801-444-0404	bdewart@yahoo.com	?	I would like to see Main Street and Gentile Street intersection improvements be completed before Main Street overpass is closed. This will be a major detour route for people coming from Kaysville onto Fort Lane to Gentile to return back onto Main Street while the new interchange is being constructed.	Should a build alternative be selected, construction would be phased to minimize impacts. The phasing of the construction would be decided in the design phase, with your suggestion being considered as part of that decision.
21	Geddes	Jake	261 East 900 South, Layton, Utah 84841	801-336-8912	geddesfam@gmail.com	?	I would like to know if 900 South will become a dead end street?	The Preferred Alternative would include the closure of 900 South on the eastern end into a cul-de-sac as part of the closure of the at-grade railroad crossing.

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
22	Scholes	Elizabeth	716 South 300 East, Layton, Utah 84041		Elizabeth-Scholes@mail.weber.edu	No	<p>I am not sure who designed this eye sore. I did not know that Layton was in need of a castle wall between us and Kaysville. It is ugly and it hides this nice city. Furthermore, the Preferred Alternative does not meet some concerns. For instance,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where is the storm water going? Is Flint Street going to has a street light? Why doesn't Layton want our subdivision (since no one is going to believe that it is in Layton with this.)? Where do you expect all the traffic of a five lane freeway to go when it meets Flint Street, which barely manages two lanes? What is going to happen to the old railroad station? The hospital which is currently planning to go in the area does not want 750 South to access the subdivision through 200 East. How do you propose to allow traffic out without access there? Why is there no straight access to Main Street, which is a needed North-South alternative to the congested freeway? During construction, how is access going to be maintained for those working individuals in the area who currently walk to the commuter rail stop or other public transportation from this area? Are the wetlands going to be replaced? Who is going to fund the driving of vehicles from this area, gas is not cheap? But my biggest questions are WHY IS NO ONE LISTENING? and WHY DOES IT HAVE TO LOOK SO UGLY? I think if it is going to look like these plans, someone should change Layton's signs to say Layton the ugliest city in the valley! 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stormwater would be collected in curbs and gutters along the roadway and enter catch basins and the new storm drain pipe system through a series of drop inlets. The new storm drain system would be designed and managed according to the requirements of the Utah Department of Water Quality (UDWQ), including slow management controls, oil skimmers, grease traps, etc. as required in order to minimize negative impacts to water quality. For more details on the proposed design, see Section 3.2.2 - Water Quality (page 3-76 in particular) in the Draft EIS. It is anticipated that Flint Street would be signalized when warranted by traffic. Comment noted. As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020. Doug & Emmy's would not have access from Main Street under the Preferred Alternative. Efforts are being made to preserve the building, possibly in a new location. See the Memorandum of Agreement between UDOT, SHPO and Layton City in Appendix C. Any future development plans for the parcels of farmland that would be on both sides of the 750 South connection are uncertain at this point and are beyond the scope of this project. The connection of 200 East to the 750 South connection is a Layton City issue. Main Street would be accessible from the 750 South connection, as well as from Gentile Street via either Flint Street or Fort Lane. Pedestrian access to public transportation would be maintained during construction. Details would be determined in the design phase. The Preferred Alternative would impact a total of 0.8 acres of wetland. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has not yet determined whether these wetlands are jurisdictional. If they so determine, mitigation would be required as compensation for the wetland acreage and functions lost. See Section 3.2.6 - Wetlands of the Draft EIS for further information. Comment noted. Aesthetics for the proposed Layton Interchange would be considered in the design phase with public input to be included (should a build alternative be selected).

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
23	Hendry	Paula			jazzphins@msn.com	?	I am inquiring on the effect this will have on the North Davis Gymnastics Facility which is at 249 South Main in Layton. I have read about that there are 5 proposed options for this interchange. Where can you find and view these options? If you can please email me this information, I would greatly appreciate it. Any information would be helpful.	<p>The Draft EIS is available for review on the website (www.udot.utah.gov/laytoninterchange) and in hard copy at the Layton City offices and the Davis County library. Chapter 2 discusses the development and screening of the alternatives and outlines the Preferred Alternative.</p> <p>Under the Preferred Alternative, the North Davis Gymnastics Facility is identified as a potential relocation due to the on and off ramps for the proposed new interchange. See Section 3.1.5 - Relocations in the Draft EIS. A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</p>
24	Young	Gary	137 King Street, Layton, Utah 84041	801-544-8200		Yes	My concern is with the potential closing of two of the long standing cafes. I cannot understand why the alignment cannot be further south to allow for Sills to remain with an access side road. Also, everyone figures Doug & Emmy's would remain with access but the plans show no access because of the slope of Main Street. Owners of both cafes have been blindsided by lack of information. Long time patrons should not have to lose their social gathering places all at once. This overpass is needed but both cafes should not be sacrificed to appease long term planners who only want to line their pockets. Align this overpass further south and use the land where the pumping station (?) resides.	<p>A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</p> <p>The impacts to Sill's Cafe and Doug & Emmy's under the Preferred Alternative are regrettable, but unavoidable due to the geographic constrictions that exist in the area, namely, the UPRR/UTA railroad tracks, Main Street and downtown Layton, and I-15, including elevations. To move the interchange further south than shown would encroach upon the UPRR/UTA tracks and would put the new interchange too close to I-15 for traffic flow. Doug & Emmy's would not be directly impacted but the required elevation of Main Street to meet the new interchange would eliminate access to the property.</p>
25	Lundgreen	Robert	563 South 175 West, Layton, Utah 84041	801-544-5166	robertsharon@yahoo.com	Yes	I live just 120 ft from the proposed road going west from the interchange, about one block west of Flint Street. This is needed now and is the best alternative. Make sure the grass, sidewalk and trees are part of the new east/west roadway. Be sure to make the new intersections large enough, with turn lanes to exit and enter roadways, plus signal lights provided.	Aesthetic treatments, such as landscaping, will be determined in the design phase of the project (should a build alternative be chosen). The Preferred Alternative does include sidewalks along the 750 South connection and Main Street. Signal lights would be provided at the Main Street and Flint Street intersections.
26	Isbell	Sue	510 East 405 South, Layton, Utah 84041	801-546-2624	sueisbell@msn.com	No	I live one house away from Fort Lane, which has always been a rural road. I am very concerned with the traffic that will be diverted south on Fort Lane. All traffic southbound to South Layton or Kaysville will have no other alternative but Fort Lane. I suggest somehow keeping Main Street an open route from Layton to Kaysville. The traffic and noise will be unbearable and I feel virtually impossible for our subdivision to be able to make left-hand turns from 405 South.	The Main Street overpass would be removed as part of the Preferred Alternative to accommodate the placement of the new proposed interchange. Main Street traffic would be rerouted north along Fort Lane to the 750 South connection intersection. Fort Lane is also anticipated to become a five-lane roadway in the future under Layton City's Master Plan.
27	Infanzon	Anselmo	189 South Main Street, #77, Layton, Utah 84041	801-678-5876		Yes (Si)	<p>Es por una major vialidad ya que ahora el paso de los carros es muy lento. [It is a better alternative since currently the traffic is too slow.]</p> <p>Ahora la preocupacion es que segun el proyecto nuestra mobile home, quendara muy cerca del freeway y tal vex el ruido y los peligros sean mayores ya que quedamos casi pagados a la via tal ves ustedes tengan que preveer moveinos a nosotros tambien ya que tal vez se enfrenten a problemas con mas vecinos que tememos familias y ninos pequenos (3) que siempre en verano uegan el la yorda. [Now the concern is that according to the project, our mobile home would be located very close to the freeway and possibly the noise and dangers will be greater since we are close to the corridor. Perhaps you may need to provide a way to move us also since maybe you will run into problems with more neighbors that have families and small children (3) that always play in their yards during the summer.]</p>	A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. See Section 3.1.5 - Relocations of the Draft EIS.
28	Semandeni	Heidi	966 South 50 West, Layton, Utah 84041			?	With the proposed noise wall on the west side of the freeway, it would be better on the west side of the tracks to eliminate the noise wall from the railroad as well as from the highway. This would require Union Pacific and UTA to maintain the wall and it would be good to get dialogue started with them to see if that's a possibility.	The noise wall is recommended in this area, but would not be included in the build alternative unless it is approved through the balloting process under the UDOT Noise Abatement Policy. The balloting process would be performed in the design phase, should a build alternative be selected. See Section 3.1.8 of the DEIS for more information. Should it be approved, the exact placement will be determined in the design phase.

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
29	Parrish	Bob				No	<p>This project is not going to work. They need to approach this from a different angle. They’ve got some problems with elevations that I don’t think that they’re going to be able to overcome. I mean anything can be done, but this is not the way to do this. They’re going to affect way too many people, they’re going to cause a lot of problems and duress, and I can just visualize this thing going about like they are down there around Lagoon in this Farmington area. If they want to tear this town up for twenty-five, thirty years, if that’s what they’ve got planned, then I guess it will work for them, but this isn’t the way to go. I mean, you know, I’ve got some problem with the elevation. Maybe it’s as much as they can give us for that given moment that they’ve got displayed here, but this is kind of like, you know, a -- it doesn’t depict really what I’m interested in and what I really want to see. I mean it’s just a very, very rough draft.</p> <p>And I mean water quality, wetlands, no impact, that’s -- you know, one acre lost, that’s pure -- that’s totally incorrect information that they’re giving. A lot of the information they’re giving here on what the impacts are and the No-action Alternatives and Preferred Alternatives, I mean it’s totally incorrect because they don’t -- you know, I’ve watched literally thousands of gees land on the Flint property all year long, I mean all winter long. They feed out there, you know, the wetlands and, you know, the animals, the birds. I mean and if you fill that full of asphalt, you’re going to have a lot more water running off into your -- into your -- you know, your flood canals. I mean Kay’s Creek is -- they’re dumping stuff in Kay’s Creek they shouldn’t even be dumping in it. It’s Layton City’s responsibility, and they’re the ones that are doing it. I mean maybe they’ve got a grandfather clause that they can dump into Kay’s Creek whenever they want, but that’s a pure water source off of the Wasatch Mountains, and it’s contaminated from the -- from the time it leaves all the way down through now, and I’m totally opposed to that. I’m sixty years old, and when I was a kid, we used to actually catch trout out of Kay’s Creek, and I’d like to see them clean it up and make it nice. I just don’t want to see them build this thing. I think it’s going to affect too many people.</p> <p>It’s a dead end onto Flint Street, which is just totally wrong in what they’re doing there. They’ve got a proposal to run it on down I guess, you know, sometime in the future. Sully come here. This guy right here, he’s got about a two million dollar house down there that he lives in right off Weber Lane.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The elevation of the 750 South connection is necessary in order to accommodate the required clearances for the railroad and I-15, which means that Main Street must also be elevated to meet it. The Preferred Alternative would impact a total of 0.8 acres of wetland. The Wetland Delineation, which was prepared by a qualified professional using approved methods, was submitted to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for review. The USACE has not yet determined whether these wetlands are jurisdictional. If they so determine, mitigation would be required as compensation for the wetland acreage and functions lost. See Section 3.2.6 - Wetlands of the Draft EIS for further information Stormwater would be collected in curbs and gutters along the roadway and enter catch basins and the new storm drain pipe system through a series of drop inlets. The new storm drain system would be designed and managed according to the requirements of the Utah Department of Water Quality (UDWQ), including slow management controls, oil skimmers, grease traps, etc. as required in order to minimize negative impacts to water quality. For more details on the proposed design, see Section 3.2.2 - Water Quality (page 3-76 in particular) in the Draft EIS. As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020.
30	Anderson	Brandt	Candy Campus Daycare			?	<p>The owners of Candy Campus are concerned with some of the following: As we look at your alternative map, we’re concerned that the X’s on the map don’t actually show our business, the yellow business that is just north of the actual Sills Cafe building.</p> <p>The other thing as we look at your map , we’re concerned with the road that comes down and turns into a cul-de-sac in front of our business. We’re concerned that that will affect our business, the access for our day-care workers and also the parents that bring their children to the daycare, which is about eighty a day. We’re concerned that the roundabout limits parking and takes out our existing parking lot and will affect our business.</p> <p>As we look at the impact to our business through that construction taking two years, we feel that parents will be frustrated driving through the construction area to access Candy Campus for the period of two years, and like I said before, we’re concerned that the parking is going to be eliminated, and our businesses are so close to each other, the two businesses, one you found historic and the other one that’s to the south next to Sills, the parking basically is eaten up and the access will be no longer.</p>	<p>Potential impacts to the Candy Campus Daycare property are shown in 2 different figures; one showing all potential relocations in the area and one showing the potential impacts to Section 4(f) resources. The Candy Campus Daycare property includes a building that qualifies for Section 4(f) protection and another building which does not. The yellow building referred to is not eligible for Section 4(f) protection, but it may be impacted by the proposed cul-de-sac that would be built to provide access to the Candy Campus Daycare property. It is therefore identified as a potential relocation. Whether relocation is actually necessary would be determined in the design and right-of-way acquisition phase through discussions between the property owners and UDOT. This would include concerns about parking impacts as well. A step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended.</p> <p>As for construction impacts, access to the businesses will be maintained during construction, with the public to be kept informed about traffic routes and detours.</p>
31	Parr	Valerie				?	My concern is that they take into account the new intersection, that there’s good pedestrian walkways to get from Fort Lane/Main Street intersection to the new FrontRunner station.	The Preferred Alternative includes sidewalks on the north side of the 750 South connection and on both sides of Main Street, which pedestrians can use to access the FrontRunner station from Fort Lane. See Section 3.1.7 - Pedestrians and Bicycle Facilities in the Draft EIS.

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
32	Russell	Wayne	78 North 575 Wet, Layton, Utah 84041			Yes	<p>The Alternative 2 seem to still be the only way to go on the Legacy Highway. I agree with the overpasses where they're planned and the picture as we have seen it this night, Wednesday the 7th of May.</p> <p>And also I think that we need to speed up the Legacy Highway from Farmington, which is supposed to be open this fall, through the area that is listed as the Bluff Road and stay with that area straight through to North Ogden where the interchange is just north of Smith Edwards to connect the Legacy Highway with I-15. It would save a lot of time and a lot of money, and the price of gas, I don't know that it's going to go down any at the present time, and we need it because if there's an accident -- and there's constantly accidents throughout the times you drive between here and Salt Lake -- some days it takes you an hour to two hours to get to Bountiful or Salt Lake when it should take you about thirty minutes at the road signs. An accident will hold you up from two to four hours sitting there where you can't do anything. We need an alternative route, which by going through the interchange, once we get that interchange on I-15 built -- and I hope and pray that that will be done this fall 2008, starting it. And so that the road going west to Flint Street would continue down to the Legacy Highway, which Layton City has already obtained the property for the most part.</p> <p>There is one area that I've mentioned before, that the interchange on the Layton freeway, the new one, going east rather than going on Fort Lane, if it went one group further to Fairfield and go north to the Hill Field Road, it's also wider. The city manager and mayor agrees that that would be a better route to go, which they would participate in, and it would save a lot of expense and a lot of moving and save twenty miles an hour past the two schools that the Fairfield -- or the Fort Lane would hold up the traffic. It would move and expedite traffic out of Hill Field going up Hill Field Road, down Fairfield, right into the Layton south interchange, the new one, and they could go south, or they could go north, which would be a dispersion of the people off the Hill Field Road interchange, which is a bottleneck and a debauchery of planning in the past, still is. It would reduce that bottleneck considerably with this new interchange to get in and out of Layton, and also people from Syracuse and West Point to take the Legacy over and up to the I-15 and going south would expedite their traffic and save a lot of time and troubles there, as well as the people going north. This would improve our area here because of the homes that are being build in West Kaysville and West Layton and in the main part of Layton as well. There's still a lot of spaces open.</p>	<p>The construction of Legacy Highway is beyond the scope of this project.</p> <p>To address your comment as to the I-15 connection to Fort Lane, rather than Fairfield, this possibility was considered, but to extend the 750 South connection farther east would have greater impacts in the form of relocations and is beyond the scope of this project. Further, it is not on Layton City's Master Plan.</p>

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
33	Anonymous						<p>The condensed housing that’s going in on King Street south of the railroad back of Smith plant is going to impact that road into King, and it needs to be going someplace other than up Gentile, which is loaded now. The traffic on Gentile exceeds the thirty mile speed limit by ten to thirty miles an hour at times. I will go down that twenty -- or thirty miles an hour and I’ll have people pass me in the turning lane going at least twenty to thirty miles faster than I’m going. It’s dangerous for the school, it’s dangerous for the people walking in the crosswalks there, and it will get worse if we don’t do something about it. I would hope and pray that the Legacy Highway gets the property lines borne out and finalized with the environmentalist people to approve UDOT to be able to get that road in as soon as possible, hopefully not over seven years. Wishfully thinking, three to four. We need it very much to save the wasted time and traffic and fuel and the emissions going into the air by sitting for two hours and moving a mile or two an hour. I hope this is useful, because we’ve got the mayor of Syracuse and West Haven that are and plan on building houses right where the Legacy Highway goes through, and something needs to be done quickly with the legislature to stop that and require the mayors that approve those buildings and their city councils to pay for the excess costs involved so the taxpayers don’t have to take the brunt of their bad planning. It still is a majority rule or the democratic rule, and I think the majority of the people in Clinton, West Point, Syracuse, and the lower part of Roy and Hooper would use that road tremendously. They’re already planning on 2000 West and 2600 West roads to widen to develop those homes over there. Appreciate the opportunity. Thank you very much.</p>	<p>King Street is planned for expansion, which should help with traffic in that area. Gentile Street will remain a three-lane facility, but will experience a reduction in traffic congestion when all routes on the WFRM RTP and Layton City’s Master Plan are built.</p> <p>The construction of Legacy Highway and the planning and zoning decisions of Syracuse and West Haven are beyond the scope of this project</p>
34	Gwilliam	Bruce and Lorraine				Yes	We both approve of Alternative 2 as has been presented.	Thank you for your comment.
35	Scott	Greg	760 East 425 South, Layton, Utah 84041			?	<p>I’m worried about pedestrian crossing over the freeway with a single point urban interchange. They’re generally pretty hard to get across, and I’d encourage you all to look at innovative ways to get pedestrians across the freeway there.</p> <p>On another topic, also I’d encourage you all to think about the -- the traffic impacts of where the interchange road would “T” into Fort Lane and the impacts on people that -- that live along Fort Lane, but I do like where it’s shown now and would be nervous if it were to be realigned to the north or south of where it’s shown on the aerial photos. That’s it.</p>	<p>Improving pedestrian facilities is an important goal for FHWA in all of the transportation projects with which it is involved, just as it is with this project. Also, both UDOT and Layton City are committed to providing pedestrian facilities in connection with this proposed project that are safe while at the same time consistent with the purpose and need for the proposed transportation improvement. In this case, an 8-ft sidewalk would be provided along the north side of the 750 South connection from Flint Street to Fort Lane (including pedestrian facilities through the proposed interchange on I-15) and along both sides of Main Street. These facilities, being within 0.3 miles of the new Frontrunner station, would provide pedestrian access to the FrontRunner station from both Fort Lane on the east and any new proposed UTA parking on the west, should it be implemented in the future.</p> <p>The proposed project would include high quality pedestrian facilities on the SPUI interchange over I-15, including whatever necessary, state-of-the-art pedestrian safety devices that are determined to be the most effective in helping to ensure pedestrian safety while crossing I-15 and Main Street.</p> <p>To respond to your concern about impacts to Fort Lane, Layton City’s Master Plan shows Fort Lane as being five lanes in the future.</p>
36	Nuttall	Tom	462 South 450 West, Layton, Utah 84041			?	<p>I guess my concern is that the extension of 750 South to Angel street needs to be completed at the same time the main interchange project is completed so that there’s a place for the traffic to go at least down to Angel if not further, and my understanding is that anything further will have to be developed by the developers, but I would like to see those completed at the same time so that we don’t have inordinate amount of traffic being dumped on Flint Street from the interchange. So that’s basically the concern I have. Thank you very much.</p>	<p>As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020.</p> <p>The 750 South extension to Angel Street is a Layton City issue and beyond the scope of this project. However, the 750 South extension is on Layton City’s Master Plan and Layton City is committed to its construction in a timely manner.</p>

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
37	Brown	Louise	343 South 750 East, Layton, Utah 84041			?	There is a -- on the corner of Gentile and Fort Lane -- that's the area I'm talking about -- that segment of this project has been under consideration and there has in the past been some talk about a big box project going on that corner. The city council had the wisdom to put a moratorium on that corner, and as a citizen of Layton and an individual who lives in the area, I'm simply going on record as saying thank you to the city council for doing that and would encourage them to continue with the original intent of this project; namely a sustainable, walkable community of attractive, Gateway-like buildings, a mixed use that has residences and transportation and commerce all together. The big box proposal is something that should not, has no place in this project. That's it.	The future development and zoning of land is determined by Layton City.
38	Scholes	Bob	716 South 300 East, Layton, Utah 84041			No?	<p>My address puts me west of the railroad track and about two houses south of the interchange. I would like to see retaining walls put in for the overpass that's coming rather than just sloped dirt because nobody is maintaining the current overpass, which has sloped dirt, and all that comes out of that is garbagey and weedy, the whole slope. This is going to turn into the same thing based on everything I've seen, and nothing is there seems to consider the impact on the houses around it.</p> <p>I also don't see the worth of the little road that cuts off and goes down to Candy Campus. I don't mind the road cutting off and going over into that area, but bringing it back underneath there back to Candy Campus is probably a waste of money because those businesses won't thrive anyway. Anything else?</p>	The decision as to whether to implement retaining walls will be determined in the design phase (should a build alternative be chosen). As for the access road on the east of Main Street, several of the properties in that area qualify for Section 4(f) protection from impact, which includes a loss of access to the property. Therefore, access to those properties needs to be maintained. See Chapter 4 of the Draft EIS.
39	Scholes	Cheryl	716 South 300 East, Layton, Utah 84041			No?	They haven't address my greatest concern. Quite honestly, though, I hate the fact that you're going to take my view both north and east. The thing that worries me the most is that you still leave me in a traffic circle. At the current time, when something -- when 900 South is stopped so we can't exit that way, if there is a backup on the freeway, we get trapped in a traffic circle that goes out 200, up Flint, and backs up to the main part up Gentile or out Gentile, and we can't get out of our subdivision. That is not being corrected by this in any way, shape, or form. We will still be trapped in the same kind of traffic circle. They have never addressed it. I've asked about it over and over and over again. (Bob) She's referring to the increased amount of traffic on Flint Street makes it impossible to get out.	<p>As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020.</p> <p>Also, there is the potential for a new access through 200 East to the 750 South connection, depending upon Layton City and the future development of the land through which the 750 South connection is proposed to extend.</p>
40	Tatton	Sherri	Costume shop			?	My concern is if they take the overpass and drop it to Flint Street, the people aren't destined for Flint Street. They're going to go somewhere. I think they're going to use Flint Street, and they're going to do one of two things. If they're headed south, they'll go to Kaysville, but ninety percent of the traffic right now is coming up Gentile, and I'm already blocked by trains daily and now FrontRunner. I mean the traffic backs up right past Main Street. My concern is: Dropping it off at Flint Street, they're still going to come around and go up Gentile and it will create more traffic on Gentile and in the future could possibly take us out. That's my concern. Thank you.	As indicated in Appendix B - Traffic Memo on 750 South Phasing in the Draft EIS, traffic modeling showed that Flint Street traffic in 2010 would generally decrease north of 750 South and increase south of 750 South with the implementation of the Preferred Alternative. Traffic on Flint Street would improve in both directions by 2020, provided 750 South west of Flint Street is constructed between 2015 and 2020. The traffic model also showed that the Preferred Alternative would provide LOS D or better along Gentile Street.
41	Scholes	Robert			robert.scholes@HILL.af.mil	No	Though I realize Horrocks was only tasked to confirm the previously established Layton Interchange design with supporting evidence, how refreshing it would be if you had been innovative enough to look a little outside the box. The attached article found in USA Today, this morning, looks at some innovative ways cities have handled their transportation needs. Please notice that most of these plans are getting rid of unsightly overhead expressways freeways. Yet, Layton and UDOT are now planning to build that very type of interchange. Please take a lesson from these other cities before totally destroying the blighted downtown. I have previously suggested putting the interchange over the freeway but under the railroad tracks. Though Horrocks casually dismissed this approach, if Main Street is shifted eastward and lowered, I think a serious study would show this is doable. It is not the original plan that Horrocks does not want to deviate from, but it would increase the opportunity for downtown Layton to blossom. In contrast, as the article indicates built-up, overhead roadways tend to discourage development. Please think about it.	<p>During the Alternatives Development and Screening process, many different options were reviewed for their feasibility. Your suggestion of putting an interchange over I-15 but under the railroad tracks would have not been feasible. The proximity of I-15 to the railroad tracks in the area means that it would have been difficult, if not impossible, to maintain an acceptable grade for the roadway. Since Main Street is adjacent to the railroad tracks, there would not be room to go over Main Street yet under the railroad tracks so Main Street would have to be lowered in order to access the new roadway, which would impact the downtown area as well as elevating it and would add the additional problem of how to deal with the high water table in the area.</p> <p>Layton City has designated the downtown area for redevelopment and the new interchange is anticipated to facilitate that development by providing better access to I-15 and reducing congestion in the area.</p>
42	Jackson	Jeri			jeri@eye-sightvision-center.com	?	How does this project affect North Davis Gymnastics located behind Sills Cafe?	Under the Preferred Alternative, the North Davis Gymnastics Facility is identified as a potential relocation due to the on and off ramps for the proposed new interchange. See Section 3.1.5 - Relocations in the Draft EIS.

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
43	Simnitt	Loren			lsimnitt@earthlink.net	?	Thank you for sending me this notice. My concern is that there be enough room for bicyclists to travel safely on the road with traffic.	The Preferred Alternative would include bicycle lanes along both sides of the 750 South connection. See Section 3.1.7 - Pedestrians and Bicycle Facilities in the Draft EIS.
44	Scott	Greg	780 East 425 South, Layton, Utah 84041 WFRC 295 Jimmy Doo-little Road, Salt Lake City, Utah 84116	801-363-4250 x119	gscott@wfrc.org	?	<p>The area on the northeast corner of the LPS interchange is, as I understand it, master planned for a mixed-use development. I'm asking that pedestrian access from the Layton FrontRunner be made easy, safe, and as short as is reasonable. Please look into a separate pedestrian crossing over the freeway, non-SPUI design alternatives, or at least pedestrian friendly designs for the SPUI if a SPUI is necessary and a pedestrian overpass is not possible.</p> <p>Also, if you are going to have pedestrians cross on the freeway interchange, please look into providing pedestrian facilities down the north facing embankment from the east end of the I-15 interchange to shorten the walk into the planned mixed-use development. Please call me if you have questions. Thank you.</p>	<p>Improving pedestrian facilities is an important goal for FHWA in all of the transportation projects with which it is involved, just as it is with this project. Also, both UDOT and Layton City are committed to providing pedestrian facilities in connection with this proposed project that are safe while at the same time consistent with the purpose and need for the proposed transportation improvement. In this case, an 8-ft sidewalk would be provided along the north side of the 750 South connection from Flint Street to Fort Lane (including pedestrian facilities through the proposed interchange on I-15) and along both sides of Main Street. These facilities, being within 0.3 miles of the new Frontrunner station, would provide pedestrian access to the FrontRunner station from both Fort Lane on the east and any new proposed UTA parking on the west, should it be implemented in the future.</p> <p>The proposed project would include high quality pedestrian facilities on the SPUI interchange over I-15, including whatever necessary, state-of-the-art pedestrian safety devices that are determined to be the most effective in helping to ensure pedestrian safety while crossing I-15 and Main Street.</p>
45	Urbanic	John	US Army Corps of Engineers, 533 West 2600 South Suite 150, Bountiful, Utah 84010`	801-295-8380 x13	john.e.urbanic@usace.army.,il	NA	The wetland delineation has yet to be verified by this office. Wetland boundaries and wetland acreages may change from what is stated in the delineation report and the draft EIS. This may affect 404 permitting and mitigation for this project as well as timelines to obtain authorization. Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft EIS.	The wetland delineation is in the process of being reviewed by the USACE a to whether the identified wetlands are jurisdictional. The EIS contains language regarding both contingencies so the EIS process should be able to be finalized. The Section 404 permitting process would be followed, if the wetlands are determined to be jurisdictional, with appropriate mitigation measures to be included.
46	Jordison	Gail	275 East 1200 South, Bountiful, Utah 84010			?	I am writing this letter in response to a newspaper article in the Deseret News. I understand that UDOT wants to improve movement through the southern part of Layton. That may be necessary, but I hope you can come up with another plan other than what is mentioned. I'm hoping that Sill's Cafe will not have to be moved to another location, or if they do have to relocate, that UDOT will give them what they need to relocate to a comparable area. If you have never eaten at Sill's, I suggest you give them a try. We have eaten there several times and it is worth the stop. Their scones are out of this world. If the local folks go there, it is usually the best in town. I never realized that the restaurant across the street was owned by a relative of Sill. Doug & Emmy's also has great scones. Both of these restaurants should be allowed to stay where they are. I would also recommend you try Doug & Emmy's. We have eaten at both restaurants several times. As you probably are aware, there are few restaurants that have great food an yet keep their prices in check. Do what you can to solve the problem without relocating two great restaurants. Have a great day.	<p>In response to your comment, the Preferred Alternative was developed through an extensive engineering and public involvement process that looked at traffic concerns an environmental impacts. We looked at various alternatives both in this area, on Gentile Street, and at both the 200 North and Layton Hills Mall interchanges, plus combinations of the above (as requested by the public and the Community Sounding Board). All of the alternatives except the Preferred Alternative were eliminated for either a failure to meet the Purpose and Need for the project or for substantial impacts to critical resources. See Chapter 2 - Alternatives Development and Screening in the Draft EIS.</p> <p>The impacts to Sill's Cafe and Doug & Emmy's under the Preferred Alternative are regrettable, but unavoidable due to the geographic constrictions that exist in the area, namely, the UPRR/ UTA railroad tracks, Main Street and downtown Layton, and I-15, including elevations. To move the interchange further south than shown would encroach upon the UPRR/UTA tracks and would put the new interchange too close to I-15 for traffic flow. Doug & Emmy's would not be directly impacted but the required elevation of Main Street to meet the new interchange would eliminate access to the property.</p> <p>If the Preferred Alternative is selected, a step-by-step process must be followed when land is acquired for a roadway project. Property acquisitions, both partial and total, will be made according to federal guidelines and UDOT policies that include fair compensation measures for property owners. UDOT will comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. See Section 3.1.5 - Relocations of the Draft EIS.</p>

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
47	Vance	Gary	1219 Fenway Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah 84102	801-750-4771	garymv@yahoo.com	No	I don't really care about the alternative . . . all I ask is that bicycle traffic be accommodated in the construction area. I used to take the 472 express bus reverse commute from Salt Lake to Kaysville then biked across I-15 to my work. However, road construction in the area made my route impossible. The overpass and detour road were closed to pedestrians and bicyclists even though there was plenty of space on the side of the detour road for both. Now I take FrontRunner from SLC to Layton and bike southwest from the station to work through quiet, residential neighborhoods. However, the major interchange construction project just south of the commuter rail station will disrupt my commute once again. The Layton station is filled with bicycle commuters and pedestrians. PLEASE ACCOMMODATE BICYCLISTS AND PEDESTRIANS IN THE CONSTRUCTION AREA! It can be easily achieved and, having also lived in Colorado and Washington, I know that this approach is common in other parts of the country.	The Preferred Alternative would include bicycle lanes along both sides of the 750 South connection. See Section 3.1.7 - Pedestrians and Bicycle Facilities in the Draft EIS. During construction, the public will be kept informed as to construction detours, which will include pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Your suggestions will be taken into consideration at that time.
48	Pollard	Melvin E. and Louise K.	225 West 750 South, Layton, Utah 84041	801-544-0345	mepollard@earthlinknet	Yes	It looks as though the Preferred Alternative is the one that impacts the surrounding area the least for the most benefit. The safety provided by overpasses and the increased traffic capacity is a very attractive feature to use. Let's “. . . get ‘er done.”	Thank you for your comment.
49	Smith	Rick	597 South 925 East, Layton, Utah 84041	801-498-7717	rdjosmith@netzero.com	No	<p>I agree on an interchange, but Main Street is non-stopped/rerouted. Main Street should stay as a continuous north-south route. Use old on-ramp as approach for bridge over I-15, then down to grade at U-Haul location.</p> <p>If the current layout stays for the proposed interchange, Main Street needs to continuously flow north and south, which will require that Fort Lane be fully improved as a major arterial. These improvements on Fort Lane need to go to Gentile at a minimum and should continue all the way to Highway 193 per the City Street Master Plan and the WFRC plans. The Main Street and Fort Lane connection may require using the old alignment and possibly taking out Flinders Car Care.</p> <p>Signalized intersections will need to be coordinated. Several in a short distance.</p>	<p>The Main Street overpass would be removed as part of the Preferred Alternative to accommodate the placement of the new proposed interchange. Main Street traffic would be rerouted north along Fort Lane to the 750 South connection intersection. Fort Lane is also anticipated to become a five-lane roadway in the future under Layton City's Master Plan.</p> <p>Coordination of the signalized intersections is a maintenance issue and an ongoing process.</p>
50	Terraventure		475 North 300 West Suite 204, Kaysville, Utah 84037	801-546-6000	deaii@theadmsco.com		We are supportive of the interchange; however, we have concerns with the eastern portion of the overpass. We are working with UDOT, Layton City, an adjacent land owners in hopes to resolve our issues.	Thank you for your comment.

No.	Last Name	First Name	Address	Phone Number	Email	Agree with Preferred Alternative?	Comment (in some instances, numbers were added for organization with responses)	Response
51	Marquardt	Chris And Analisa			mar-quardt12@msn.com		What is the impact of the HOV lanes current being developed to this interchange? I understand that the HOV lanes will be ending and starting in Layton, but I haven't seen any documentation of how the lanes will interact with the current traffic lanes. Will the HOV lanes have their own exit ramp at the new interchange, or will drivers have to merge all the way across to make the Layton exit?	No HOV only exit ramp is planned for this interchange as part of the project. Drivers using the HOV lane will have to exit the HOV lane when allowed by the striping and merge to the outside lane, as is the case with the majority of the other interchanges on I-15.